

REMARKS

The office action of February 6, 2006, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claims 17-24, 26, 27, 30, 33, 35, 37-42 and 44-48 are pending in the application. Note that claims 41-48 were incorrectly numbered as claims 42-49 in the previous amendment. In particular, claims 32-48 were added in the previous amendment, but were incorrectly numbered as 32-40 and 42-49 (claim 41 was unintentionally omitted). Previously numbered claims 42-49 are correctly listed herein as claims 41-48.

By this amendment, claims 16, 25, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36 and 43 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 17-19, 22, 26, 27, 30, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40 and 44 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Note that claims 33, 35, 37 and 44 have been rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter of their respective base claim and any intervening claims. However, these claims have not been substantively amended.

Claims 16, 18, 19, 22-26, 28-30, 31, 32-39, 40, 41, 43 and 44

Claims 16, 18, 19, 22-26, 28-30, 32-39, 41, 43 and 44 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,070,184 Blount et al. (Blount) in view of U.S. patent no. 6,011,537 to Slotznick (Slotznick) and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,038,601 to Lambert et al. (Lambert). Claims 31 and 40 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Blount in view of Lambert. Claims 16, 25, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36 and 43 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 18, 19, 22-24, 26, 30, 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 44 are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 33 recites, among other features, the subject matter of checking whether any non-selected item of information from the plurality of items of information includes a preloadable indication, which includes an attribute indicating that the any non-selected item of information is pre-loadable and associated information for the attribute, in which the any non-selected item of information includes a link and the attribute and associated information are part

of the link. This subject matter is not taught or suggested by the cited prior art including Lambert.

In contrast, Lambert discloses lookahead tags and algorithms for a web page, which are in the meta-data or MIME data for the page and, thus, are not included in any links on the page. Lambert, col. 20, line 4 to col. 22, line 58. The Lambert lookahead tag and algorithm for an initial web page determines the depth and number of links from that initial web page to be chased, but the Lambert lookahead tag is not included in a link. Lambert simply does not teach or suggest that any particular links on the initial web page include a lookahead tag as asserted in the office action. In fact, the Lambert lookahead tag works *in an opposite manner*. Rather than starting with the links to identify lookahead tags and information to fetch, Lambert teaches that the lookahead tag *in the web page meta-data is the starting point* from which links to be chased are identified. Lambert simply does not teach that the links themselves include lookahead tags.

The office action asserts, “Lambert does disclose associating links with the tag information” and points to col. 20, lines 36-41 and the reference to “cnn.com” to support the position that Lambert’s lookahead tags are part of links. However, Lambert clearly describes that its lookahead tag is placed “in a site meta-data page” (col. 20, line 14) or that it “can be transmitted as MIME data” (col. 20, line 17). It does not teach placing the tag in any links on the page. The Lambert system operates by identifying how many levels of links for the caching server to “look ahead” based on the lookahead tag in the meta-data/MIME data for the web site or domain. *Id.* at lines 43-49 and 62-65. It is completely contrary to the teachings of Lambert to place lookahead tags in the links. The Lambert system starts with the lookahead tag and, based thereon, proceeds to chase levels of links. *Id.* Lambert specifically teaches that the caching server only chases links as directed to do so by the lookahead tag.

In the cnn.com example referred to in the office action, a sample ICLOOKAHEAD tag is provided for the domain name “cnn.com.” The attributes of the example tag set the maximum lookahead depth to “2” and the maximum number of links to chase at “50.” *Id.* at lines 37-41. The example lookahead tag is further bound by the content for “topstories.” *Id.* Thus, the example referred to in the office action does not teach or suggest placing lookahead tags in links. It merely reinforces Lambert’s teaching of placing a lookahead tag in the meta-data for the cnn.com domain.

Lambert simply fails to teach or suggest the recited subject matter of independent claim 33 pertaining to checking whether any non-selected item of information from the plurality of items of information includes a preloadable indication, which includes an attribute indicating that the any non-selected item of information is pre-loadable and associated information for the attribute, in which the any non-selected item of information includes a link and the attribute and associated information are part of the link.

Neither Blount nor Slotnick overcome these deficiencies of Lambert, nor were they relied upon for this claimed subject matter. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 33 and claims 17, 18 and 22-24 depending therefrom are allowable over the cited prior art.

Likewise, each one of independent claims 35, 37, 39 and 40 recites the subject matter of a non-selected item of information including a link and an attribute indicating the non-selected item of information is pre-loadable and associated information are part of the link. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 35, 37, 39 and 40, as well as claims 26 and 27 depending from claim 35, are allowable over the prior art of record.

Similar to independent claim 33, each one of independent claims 19 and 30 recites the subject matter of a non-selected item of information including a link in which the preloadable indication is part of the link. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 19 and 30, as well as claims 20, 21, 41, 38, 39 and 42 depending therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 17, 20, 21, 27 and 42

Claim 17 stands rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Blount, Slotnick and Lambert and further in view of U.S. patent no. 5,973,612 to Deo et al. (Deo). Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Blount, Slotnick and Lambert and further in view of Official Notice. Claim 27 stands rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Blount, Slotnick and Lambert and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,356,529 to Zarom (Zarom). Claim 42 stands rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Blount, Slotnick and Lambert and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,182,133 to Horvitz (Horvitz). Reconsideration and allowance of claims 17, 20, 21, 27 and 42 are respectfully requested.

Claim 17, as amended, depends from independent claim 33; claims 20 and 21 depend from independent claim 19; claim 27, as amended, depends from independent claim 35; and claim 42 depends from independent claim 30. As noted above, independent claims 19, 30, 33 are allowable over Blount, Slotznick and Lambert. Neither Deo, the Official Notice, Zarom nor Horvitz overcome the deficiencies of these references with respect to independent claims 19, 30, 33 and 35 nor were they relied upon to do so. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17, 20, 21, 27 and 42 are allowable along with their respective base claim.

Claims 45-48 (previously 46-49)

Claims 45-48 (as renumbered) stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Blount, Slotznick and Lambert and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,182,133 to Horvitz (Horvitz). Reconsideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 45 recites, among other features, the subject matter of forming a list of the selected items of information for which the selected further information has been received without including the selected one or more items of information for which the selected further information has not been received. This subject matter is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

As a preliminary matter, the office action fails to provide an adequate basis for rejecting claims 45-48. The office action merely states that they do not further define over the limitations of claims 19 and 41. Applicant is unsure of the relevance of claim 19, as it was rejected on different grounds than claims 45-48 (Blount, Slotznick and Lambert without Horvitz). Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 41 has differing claim scope than claims 45-48. For instance, claim 41 recites that, for the step of displaying the list, the display does not show any selected items for which information has not been received. In contrast, independent claim 45 recites the subject matter of forming a list without including the selected one or more items of information for which the selected further information has not been received. In addition, the office action fails to identify the claimed subject matter allegedly taught or suggested by Blount in view of Slotznick or Lambert, or the claimed subject matter in addition to subject matter pertaining to forming list that is allegedly taught or suggested by the cited prior art. The office

action merely discusses Blount and Horvitz with respect to the subject matter of displaying a list as recited in claims 19 and 41 without discussing the remaining claimed subject matter of claims 19 and 41 or the claimed subject matter of claims 45-48. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the office action fails to provide an adequate basis for rejecting claims 45-48, and Applicant is unable to fully respond to the rejections of claims 45-48.

To the extent Applicant understands the rejections, Applicant notes that the office action admits Blount fails to disclose the subject matter of displaying a list as recited in claim 41, much less the subject matter of forming a list without including the selected one or more items of information as recited in independent claim 45. The office action asserts, “Blount discloses that a user can delete pending requests from the list” (page 16, lines 13-14) and, as such, the office action asserts the invention of claims 41 and 42 merely automates user actions. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this reasoning and submits that the office action fails to provide a *prima facie* basis for rejecting the subject matter of these claims including forming the recited list. Blount simply fails to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter of claim 45, with or without user assistance, of forming a list of the selected one or more items of information for which the selected further information has been received without including the selected one or more items of information for which the selected further information has not been received. Blount clearly teaches forming an overall status page that includes a list of all requests, whether they have been received or not. *See e.g.*, Blount, col. 15, lines 43-45.

Neither Slotnick nor Lambert overcome these deficiencies of Blount nor were they relied upon to do so. In addition, Horvitz fails to overcome the deficiencies of Blount. Horvitz merely discloses prefetching web pages and indicates that a user through “suitable manipulation and ‘clicks’ of a mouse” could manually examine the current contents of the cache.” Col. 10, lines 54-58.

As noted in the application as originally filed, according to one embodiment, the display may show “a list of the items of information for which further information is cached in memory 14.” Page 9, lines 7-8. “If only one received item of information is stored in the cache, this may be immediately displayed to the user on activation (518) of the key 104c.” *Id.* at lines 15-17. The list of items of received information provides a compact display from which the user can select information that is readily available from the local memory.

Application No.: 09/893,578
Amendment dated May 8, 2006
Reply to office action of February 6, 2006

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 45-48 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: May 8, 2006

By:



Anthony W. Kandare,
Registration No. 48,830

1001 G Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20001-4597
Telephone: (202) 824-3000
Facsimile: (202) 824-3001